



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

possible and necessary for everyone who would have Christian faith. Here is the crux of the whole matter. Such a surrender is possible when one's world-view permits it, otherwise it is impossible; so that the contention of the book rests ultimately upon a question of speculation though it may have been obscured by a skilful handling of the gospel material.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CRITICAL STUDIES OF SOME NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS

The point of view of Rutherford's study of two Pauline epistles¹ is indicated by a remark of Professor Hort quoted on p. 24, that the two letters "might be products of the same state of mind. Practically they were written together." By identifying Ephesians with the "letter from Laodicea" of Col. 4:16, the author finds in this hint further evidence of a close relation between the two, and a suggestion of how they came to be written at the same time. Other possible interpretations of that phrase he reviews and rejects. In the discussion he refers to the article of Professor J. Rendel Harris in the *Expository Times* (Vol. XVIII, pp. 392 ff., June, 1907), based on De Bruyne's study of the probable Marcionite origin of the series of Latin prefaces to the Pauline epistles found in some Vulgate MSS. (*Revue Bénédictine*, January, 1907). The preface to Ephesians, it seems, has been rewritten from the accepted orthodox point of view, for in its original form it appears to have been a preface to the epistle to the Laodiceans. This of course accords with Tertullian's testimony (*Adv. Marc.* v. 17) that Marcion gave to this epistle the title, *Ad Laodiceanos*.

What we have then are three letters: a personal note to Philemon, a letter to the Christians in Colossae, a circular letter to a group of congregations, Laodicea among them; all carried by one messenger, written therefore at almost the same time, and expressions of the one state of mind. The book is to explain Colossians on the basis of this situation, and after the introduction offers us a useful parallel arrangement of the text. Colossians is printed in full, and opposite each verse in the parallel column are found the passages of Ephesians and Philemon that exhibit similarity whether of thought or language. Parallels are found for practically all of Colossians, while a rough count shows that some four-fifths of Ephesians

¹ *St. Paul's Epistles to Colossae and Laodicea. The Epistle to the Colossians Viewed in Relation to the Epistle to the Ephesians. With introduction and notes by John Rutherford, B.D.* Edinburgh: Clark; New York: Scribners, 1908. x + 208 pages. \$2.25.

has been printed. While the notes are on Colossians only, attention is called to the parallels in Ephesians, and suggestive references to Johannine ideas (such as the anti-docetic allusion in the *σωματικῶς* of 2:9) help to give the epistle its place in the development of early Christian thought. One cannot help feeling, however, that it is the interpretation of Ephesians, after all, that has most to gain from this theory of the relation of the two epistles. It is not intended to be an exhaustive commentary; the notes have been selected rather with a view to helping toward an intelligent reading of the epistle. While it is perhaps no more convincing than more elaborate discussions, the theory of the relation of the two epistles is presented constructively and in a way that is easy to follow.

HAROLD H. TRYON

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
New York City

No word is needed on Abbott's *Indices to Diatessarica*² further than that their completeness will facilitate use of his *Diatessarica Parts I-VII*. But students of rabbinic legend as (possibly) reflected in the New Testament will be interested in his "Specimen of Research" on the sweetening of the waters of Marah, prefacing the Indices. More ground is covered on the "rock that followed" (I Cor. 10:4) than by Driver or Thackeray, yet in certain rather too clever positions not so convincingly. For instance, the "tree shown" to Moses (Exod. 15:25) is identified with the "bush" that "burned with fire" on Horeb (Exod. 3:2) briefly thus: (1) Moses would not have taken a flock to Horeb, had water not been there (p. xlv). (2) The "bush," growing strong despite the desert heat, i. e., "fire," because of hidden springs (Abbott compares the Arab proverb of the date with "its feet in water and its head in fire," p. xlvii), symbolized to Moses the divine source whence Israel should gain strength to endure and overcome its afflictions (pp. xlviii f., li, lviii ff.). (3) Therefore, Yahweh was described as the one "that dwelleth in the bush" (Deut. 33:16) or "that standeth . . . upon the rock in Horeb" (Exod. 17:6), so simply the "Rock" (pp. xlv-l), i. e., the "Giver of Life," i. e., "Yahweh" (p. lxii). (4) At Marah Yahweh "taught" (not "showed") Moses "the lesson of a tree," i. e., the "bush," "and God" (proper name *El*, not preposition, because a poetic source underlies similar to Num. 21:17 f.; but cf. Lagarde's theory of the derivation of the divine name from the preposition) "cast forth waters

² *Indices to Diatessarica, with a Specimen of Research*. By Edwin A. Abbott. London: Black, 1907. lxiv+152 pages.

and the waters were" (not "were made") "sweet" (Exod. 15:25; pp. xlii f., li f.); etc. This conception of Yahweh as life-giving Abbott finds controlling in Jesus' thought which the Fourth Gospel correctly reflects; whence the terms, "life" and "living water" (p. lxiii)!

A less clever but more substantial approach to the Fourth Gospel is made in *The Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel*.³ I summarize the following points: (1) There was only one John of Asia known to the "presbyters" of subapostolic times (p. 59). The testimony of Georgius Hamartolus and Philippus Sidetes that the apostle John suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Jews is thrown out of court as a late and variant tradition (p. 30, n. 1), though Lewis does not satisfactorily account for such a late variant tradition after what appears to have been a universal belief in the second century that John attained a ripe age and enjoyed a peaceful death. Again, Papias' testimony (Eus., *H. E.*, iii, 39:3 f.), by what seems a misconception of the $\tau\acute{\iota}$ clauses as appositives of identity, not of predicate or specification, hence objective to the verbal noun $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, is made evidence of Papias' knowledge of one John only, because the other apostles, who, for Papias, with John are the presbyters, were dead when Papias wrote, while the apostle, i. e., presbyter, John and Aristion, not a presbyter, were alive (pp. 31 f., n.). (2) Irenaeus as a former student of Polycarp reflected his views on the Fourth Gospel (p. 59) on the evidence of the letter to Florinus (Eus., *H. E.*, v, 20:4-8; pp. 26 ff.). As Irenaeus assumed the author to be the apostle, so Polycarp taught the same. But as he knew the author, his witness establishes the apostle as author or source (pp. 56-60).

But (3) Polycarp knew only of brief sermonistic narratives (pp. 31-37) written by or under the direction of John and so circulated till after the middle of the second century (hence no quotation in Justin, pp. 36 f.), when edited as one gospel by Polycarp or "at his suggestion . . . as a memorial treasury . . . of the Johannine tradition which no one else so directly preserved" (p. 62). One would like to find such definite external evidence for the existence of independent Johannine sermonistic narratives as Lewis finds in the $\tau\alpha\upsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ of the letter to Florinus; but probably, in view of Irenaeus' reference to other eye-witnesses of Jesus co-ordinately with John, this should be understood as a reference to writings, held authoritative, from the hands, directly or indirectly, of these eye-witnesses, not from John exclusively.

³ *The Irenaeus Testimony to the Fourth Gospel—Its Extent, Meaning, and Value*, "Historical and Linguistic Studies," Second Series, Vol. I, Part VII. By F. G. Lewis. Ph.D. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908. 64 pages. \$0.54 postpaid.

In his study of *διαθήκη* (*διατίθεσθαι*)⁴ Norton does a signal service by his careful lexicographical presentation of the classical use of the noun (verb) and by the extended discussion of the origin and development of the Greek conception of the will. The *διαθήκη* was originally a religious institution, the "solemn compact" or covenant, ratified by the phratry, whereby a man without sons adopted an heir. In time this adoption became constructive during the life and actual after the death of the adoptive father. Hence, the *διαθήκη* became the instrument establishing both the constructive and the actual adoption. Norton rightly emphasizes the fact that two parties are involved in the *διαθήκη*, of which one lays down the terms and the other agrees to them, though too much weight is attached to the scholiast's tale on Aristophanes' *Aves*, ll. 440 ff. (pp. 35-38). In view of the double connotation of *διαθήκη* it is easily seen how it rightly renders *berith* and yet lends itself to Paul's usage in Gal. 3:15-18.

RALPH H. FERRIS

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

RECENT TREATISES ON THEOLOGY

It is difficult to say in a brief compass all that one would like to say of the latest volume in the "International Theological Library."¹ It is the fruit of years of thought by one of our leading American theologians upon the supreme theme of theology, and those who have found inspiration and guidance from Dr. Clarke's other writings have long been looking forward to its appearance with anticipation.

It may be said at once that these expectations are more than fulfilled. *The Christian Doctrine of God* is an instructive book, full of clear thought and independent insight; but it is something better; it is a live book, dealing with realities and not with words merely, and relying for its appeal upon the assent of the reader's own experience. The spirit in which it is written may be gathered from the dedication, *Deus accipiat*.

A striking feature of the book is the absence of any reference to other writers on the same subject. While fully conversant with the literature of his theme, Dr. Clarke cites no one, and controverts no one. He deals with reasons rather than with authorities, and his argument depends for

⁴ *A Lexicographical and Historical Study of Διαθήκη from the Earliest Times to the End of the Classical Period*. "Historical and Linguistic Studies," Second Series, Vol. I, Part VI. By Frederick D. Norton, Ph.D. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908. 71 pages. \$0.79 postpaid.

¹ *The Christian Doctrine of God*. ("International Theological Library.") By William Newton Clarke, D.D. New York: Scribner, 1909. 12+477 pages. \$2.50.